

Attorney Docket No: IDF 2279 (4000-11900)

Patent

REMARKS

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Office Action dated April 10, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following.

Summary of Rejections

Claims 1-23 were pending at the time of the Office Action.

Claims 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sachse et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,985,901).

Summary of Response

Claim 14 was amended.

Claims 1-13 and 15-23 remain as originally submitted.

Remarks and Arguments are provided below.

Summary of Claims Pending

Claims 1-23 are currently pending following this response.

Response to Rejections under Section 112

In the Office Action dated April 10, 2006, Claims 14-15 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Attorney Docket No: ID# 2279 (4000-11900)

Patent

In regard to Claim 14, the language of the claim has been amended from "substantially similar" to "similar". As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 14 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Applicants note that while Claims 14 and 15 may appear contradictory in nature, the limitations present in Claims 14 and 15 do particularly point out and distinctly claim limitations relevant to the present disclosure. In particular, it is noted that each of Claims 14 and 15 are dependent on Claim 11 and as such each claim recites a unique and uncontradictory combination of limitations. Since claim 15 is not dependent on claim 14, then combination of the first and second portions of data being both similar and different is not recited.

Further, it is noted that the term "similar" does not indicate that the first and second portions of data are identical, but rather denotes that there may be some differences. As such, claim 14 may be thought of as claiming the commonality or similarity between the first and second portions of data and claim 15 may be thought of as claiming the difference between the first and second portions of data. Therefore, even if claim 15 were dependent on claim 14 the claims would not necessarily be contradictory, but would merely be claiming various aspects of the relation between the first and second portions of data.

Response to Rejections under Section 102

In the Office Action dated April 10, 2006, Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sachse et al. (U.S. Patent 6,985,901 B1).

The present disclosure is related to loading realistic test data into a database in

a test environment. Using a data loading tool, data is read from a system database and copied into a test database. The data loading tool comprises an initialization component, a control generator, an extractor component, and a loader component. The initialization component receives a request for data and identifies the requested data and any data relationally associated with the requested data in the system database. The initialization component then generates a load file indicating a record of the table, key, and any corresponding data for each requested data record, wherein the data maintains its relational integrity in the load file. The control generator generates control files for extracting and/or loading data from the system database to the test database. The extractor component utilizes the load file to extract the requested and related data from the system database and the loader component loads the extracted data into the test database based on the generated control files.

United States Patent No. 6,985,901 to Sachse et al., herein Sachse, discloses monitoring network events, manipulating data related to the network events, and storing the manipulated data in a database (Sachse: column 10, lines 16-39; column 13, lines 30-67; column 18, lines 2-13; and column 33, lines 5-31). While Sachse does disclose that the manipulated data may be stored in a plurality of databases such as a database for testing purposes there is no disclosure on how the testing database is populated (Sachse: column 33, lines 25-29).

As the present disclosure claims a novel approach for loading realistic test data from a system database into a test database, the lack of disclosure on how Sachse loads the testing database along with the differences in the sources of data for loading a test database results in non-obvious differences in specific details of the structures

and methods used to implement the two disclosures.

I. Sachse does not disclose an initialization component.

Claim 1 recites, "an initialization component operable to use data and a key of a first table of a database to generate a load file identifying at least one key related to the key of the first table and data associated with the at least one key".

The Office Action refers to column 35, lines 8-15 of Sachse to teach the above recited limitations. It is noted that the above identified section of Sachse discloses a Database Developer may be installed on a server. There is no disclosure of using data and a key of a first table to generate a load file identifying at least one key related to the key of the first table and data associated with the at least one key.

It is noted that Sachse does disclose that the database can use keys to identify records and that a script can be used to extract key information in order to load the manipulated data into the database (Sachse: column 33, lines 62-67; column 34, lines 46-54). There is no disclosure or suggestion that the script uses data and a key from a table to generate a load file identifying another key and data in the table.

Also, it is noted that Sachse discloses that the database may be backed up using scripts. One such script may generate a list of files that need to be backed up (Sachse: column 42, lines 30-57). There is no disclosure or suggestion in this teaching that the script uses data and key from a table in a database to generate the list. Nor is there any disclosure or suggestion that the list indicates another key and data in the table.

II. Sachse does not disclose an extractor component.

Claim 1 recites, "an extractor component operable to extract data from the database based on the load file".

The Office Action refers to column 50, lines 36-39 of Sachse to teach the above recited limitations. As discussed above, this section teaches a script may be run to load data into the database. There is no data being extracted from the database. Further, no data is being extracted from the database based on the load file since, as discussed above in I., Sachse does not disclose generating a load file.

III. Sachse does not disclose a loader component.

Claim 1 recites, "a loader component operable to load the data extracted by the extractor component into the target database utilizing the at least one control file".

The Office Action refers to column 50, lines 36-44 to teach the above recited limitations. While this section of Sachse does disclose a control file may be used to load data into a database, there is no teaching or suggestion that the data being loaded is the same data that is extracted by the extractor component. As such, the combination of limitations as a whole is not disclosed by Sachse.

In regard to Claims 2-10, Applicants note that each and every limitation has not been taught for at least the reasons detailed with regard to claim 1.

In regard to Claim 11, Applicants note that each and every claim limitation was not taught by the disclosure of Sachse. Applicants note that similar limitations are present in Claim 11 that were discussed in regard to Claim 1. As such the arguments

Attorney Docket No: IDF 2279 (4000-11900)

Patent

detailed in I-IV are repeated herein for Claim 11.

In regard to Claims 12-18, Applicants note that each and every limitation has not been taught for at least the reasons detailed with regard to Claim 11.

In regard to Claim 18, Applicants note that each and every claim limitation was not taught by the disclosure of Sachse. Applicants note that similar limitations are present in Claim 18 that were discussed in regard to Claim 1. As such the arguments detailed in I-IV are repeated herein for Claim 18.

In regard to Claims 19-23, Applicants note that each and every limitation has not been taught for at least the reasons detailed with regard to Claim 18.

Related Prior Art

United States PG-PUB 2003/0212986 to Nelin et al. discloses that scripts may be run to set up a test environment including setting up test data, however, there is no teaching or suggestions on how the test data is set up (paragraph 0015).

United States Patent No. 6,581,052 to Slutz discloses generating database query statements in order to test database management systems, however there is no teaching or suggestion of generating test data (abstract).

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. If the Examiner has any questions or comments or otherwise feels it would be helpful in expediting the application, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (972) 731-2288.

Attorney Docket No: IDF 2279 (4000-11900)

Patent

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any further fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 21-0765, Sprint.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

6/26/2006Michael W. Piper

Michael W. Piper

Reg. No. 39,800

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 731-2288
(972) 731-2289 (facsimile)

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT